

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| RONNIE LUCKETT, |) | No. ED CV 14-00093-FMO (VBK) |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND |
| |) | RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES |
| v. |) | MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| |) | |
| SECRETARY OF CORRECTIONS, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge ("Report").

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

IT IS ORDERED that: (1) the Court accepts the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge, and (2) the Court declines to issue a Certificate of Appealability ("COA").¹

DATED: July 21, 2014

/s/

 FERNANDO M. OLGUIN
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Under 28 U.S.C. §2253(c)(2), a COA may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." The Supreme Court has held that, to obtain a Certificate of Appealability under §2253(c), a habeas petitioner must show that "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further'." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000)(internal quotation marks omitted); see also Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S.Ct. 1029 (2003). After review of Petitioner's contentions herein, this Court concludes that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, as is required to support the issuance of a COA.